a unitary whole, Hitter's answer is not very clear. In his concluding chapter he asserts that the multicellular organism behaves like a single molecule. £ The organism is an element chemically speaking because it reacts in a chemical sense with another element'—namely, oxygen. He assumes that consciousness is the product of oxygenation of all tissues of the body. And he speaks of this as the organismal theory of consciousness. The problem of the teleological nature of activities of organisms is not faced.

I find the constructive side weak, although the critical side is strong. These remarks about consciousness and the organism as a molecule are hardly to be taken seriously as contributions to a physico-chemical explanation of the unity of the organism. Even if we take them literally, the unity of consciousness such as it is, which Ritter does not mention (though it is one, perhaps the most striking, of the evidences of the unity and individuality of the organism) remains an untouched problem. Finally Ritter tells us: ' Emergent evolution and the organismal concepts applied to living nature are the same thing looked at from different directions.'

Holistic Views of Alverdes

A position similar to Ritter's was expounded by the German zoologist. Professor F. Alverdes, in 1932. He begins by saying that recent science, after a period in which analysis predominated, has now definitely entered one in which synthetic efforts are in fashion; and he regards the holistic movement in biology as the

expression of this general tendency. * In this way of thinking, the part processes of embryological development, of regeneration, of metabolism, of external behaviour are always related to